Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 21, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed November 9, 2009.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 21, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed November 19, 2009, Claims 1-80 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628, hereinafter Anuff) in view of Abel, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084401, hereinafter Abel) and in further view of Saulpaugh,et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,548,946, hereinafter Saulpaugh).

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-63, 72-74 and 76; cancels Claims 16, 21-58, 75, and 80; and add new Claims 81-84, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79, 81-84.

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628, hereinafter Anuff) in view of Abel, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084401, hereinafter Abel) and in further view of Saulpaugh, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,548,946, hereinafter Saulpaugh).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite as following.

> 1. (Currently Amended)   A method for rendering a portal graphical user
> interface (GUI) for a portal, comprising:
>   providing a set of controls, wherein the set of controls can be
> organized in a logical hierarchy, wherein each said control represents a
> corresponding graphical element in the portal GUI, wherein each said control
> has properties that can be read and set, wherein each said control is

>implemented as one or more classes in an object-oriented programming paradigm, wherein each said control has one or more methods which can be overridden to provide specialization of each said control;
>
>traversing, using at least one processor, the logical hierarchy, wherein the traversing comprises:
>
>associating a first theme with a first control in the set of controls;
>
>rendering the first control according to the first theme;
>
>rendering any descendents of the first control according to the first theme unless the theme is overridden;
>
>overriding a second control, which is a descendent of the first control, with a second theme such that the second control uses the second theme and any descendent of the second control uses the second theme unless the second theme is overridden; and
>
>rendering the first control according to the first theme in parallel with rendering of the second control according to the second theme.

Anuff discloses a portal server that comprises a plurality of modules in a pre-determined format (Abstract). Anuff further discloses that a user can view different types of information at once through a browser (Column 3, Lines 28-32).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that viewing different types of information is a feature at the user side, while rendering different controls in parallel, as embodied in Claim 1, is a feature at the server side. Hence there is no indication in Anuff that different controls can be rendered in parallel.

In addition, the embodiment as described in Claim 1 includes features such as the second control being a descendent of the first control, and the second control is overridden with a second theme such that any descendent of the second control uses the second theme unless the second theme is overridden.

Abel discloses that a web page is localized based on a selected characteristics (Abstract). Abel further discloses that the instance of the LocalizedPage class overrides the standard Render method of the standard ASP.NET page class with a special Render method.

However, there is no indication in Abel that any descendent of the instance of the LocalizedPage class uses the special Render method unless it is overridden, and there is also

11

no indication in Abel that the rendering of the instance of the LocalizedPage class is in parallel with the rendering of the standard ASP.NET page class.

Saulpaugh discloses a message gate that is a message endpoint for a client or service to communicate with another client or service (Abstract). Saulpaugh further discloses that the message gate provides a mechanism to restrict message flow between clients and services and the messages includes event notification message (Column 17-18, Lines 63-23).

However, there is no indication in Saulpaugh that the message gate represents a corresponding graphical and functional element in the portal GUI. In addition, there is no indication in Saulpaugh that the event notification message is from another control in the same portal GUI.

Applicant also respectfully submits that neither Anuff, Abel, nor other cited references appear to disclose or render obvious the above features. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite these features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 59

The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claim 59 have been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 59, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-15, 17-20, 60-74, and 76-79

Claims 2-15, 17-20, 60-74, and 76-79 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1 or 59. Claims 2-15, 17-20, 60-74, and 76-79 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV.   Additional Amendments

Claims 81-84 have been newly added by the present Reply.   Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 81-84 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 23, 2009   By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
                                         Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                         Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928

13